

**REMARKS**

In light of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

At paragraph 1 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings, requesting that Figure 15 be designated as prior art. Applicants have requested this amendment, and submit a corrected Figure 15 concurrently herewith. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the objection to the drawings on this ground be withdrawn.

At paragraph 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the disclosure requesting that a number of run-on sentences be corrected. Applicants submit that these sentences present the subject matter of the originally presented claims and therefore submit that the sentences should remain in the specification as originally presented. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the objection to the specification on this ground be withdrawn.

At paragraph 3 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Linzer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,038,256). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner relies on various parts of Linzer et al. and specifically recite “a priori statistics” as the “codec information”. However, Applicants submit that as amended, each of the independent claims recites that the codec information is used in decoding first and second encoded bit streams (for example, see claim 1). However, Linzer et al. does not disclose the codec information being used in decoding the compressed video bit streams from the storage device, and therefore, this reference fails to teach the claimed invention. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

At paragraph 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 18 and 21-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Linzer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,038,256). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants submit that independent claim 22 contains limitations as noted above in independent claim 1 and is therefore patentable for this reason alone, and additionally as presenting an independently patentable combination in and of its own right. Furthermore, claims 18, 21 and 23-27 depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of the allowable independent claims noted above and is therefore allowable for this reason alone, and additionally as presenting independently patentable combinations in and of their own right. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 18 and 21-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place claims 1-27 in condition for allowance for allowance, and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner is unable to issue a Notice of Allowance regarding these claims, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney in order to discuss any further outstanding issues.

Early and favorable consideration are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Gordon M. Kessler  
Reg. No. 38,511  
(212) 588-0800

**REMARKS**

Entry of the above amendments to Fig. 15 is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Early and favorable consideration are respectfully submitted.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By:



Gordon M. Kessler  
Reg. No. 38,511  
(212) 588-0800